



Attorney Docket No.: JA999-165

AF
JAW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s) Fujino et al.
Docket No.: JA999-165
Serial No.: 09/669,598
Filing Date: September 26, 2000
Group: 2178
Examiner: Cesar B. Paula

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, VA 22313-1450

Signature: Susan Fujino Date: January 13, 2006

Title: Electronic Form Acquiring Method, Electronic Form System, and Storage Medium for Storing Electronic Form Acquiring Program

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith are the following documents relating to the above-identified patent application:

(1) Reply Brief.

In the event of non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit **IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0510** as required to correct the error. A duplicate copy of this letter is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Mason

Dated: January 13, 2006

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

5 Applicant(s): Fujino et al.
Docket No.: JA9-99-165
Serial No.: 09/669,598
Filing Date: September 26, 2000
Group: 2178
10 Examiner: Cesar B. Paula

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature: [Signature] Date: January 13, 2006

Title: Electronic Form Acquiring Method, Electronic Form System, and Storage Medium for Storing Electronic Form Acquiring Program

15

REPLY BRIEF

20 Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25

Sir:

Appellants hereby reply to the Examiner's Answer, mailed November 16, 2005 (referred to hereinafter as "the Examiner's Answer"), in an Appeal of the final
30 rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-24 in the above-identified patent application.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

35

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

A statement identifying related appeals is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A statement identifying the status of the claims is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

5

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A statement identifying the status of the amendments is contained in Appellant's Appeal Brief.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

10

A Summary of the Invention is contained in Appellant's Appeal Brief.

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

A statement identifying the issues presented for review is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

15

CLAIMS APPEALED

A copy of the appealed claims is contained in an Appendix of Appellant's Appeal Brief.

20

ARGUMENT

Independent Claims 1-3, 9-14 and 20

Independent claims 1-3 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of Paradox. Independent claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broomhall et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Broomhall teaches that "the sponsor requests the external user's id, and password --- *form of requesting a delegated application* --- by inputting personal information, such as name, telephone number, etc. into a form."

25

Appellants note that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, requesting a user's id and password is *not* equivalent to registering form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary

30

skill in the art.

Appellants also note that Broomhall is directed to “providing secure user account identifiers and passwords to facilitate *sharing by users of data* between a secure internal server and an external server accessible over the Internet.” (See, Abstract; 5 emphasis added.) While Broomhall discloses *sharing data* by providing a user ID and password to a user, Broomhall does not address the issue of *delegating an application* to a *proxy*. The present disclosure teaches that, in the prior art, “a proxy user *submits a non-electronic form on behalf of another user*” and “the proxy user *fills necessary items in the form according to the request from the requester and files the form to a predetermined* 10 *place.*” (Page 1, second paragraph; emphasis added.) In the context of the present invention, the proxy user submits an electronic form on behalf of another user and fills necessary items in the form according to the request from the requester and files the form to a predetermined place. Broomhall, however, does not disclose or suggest a *proxy* as defined in the present invention, and does not disclose or suggest a proxy that submits an 15 electronic form on behalf of another user and fills necessary items in the form according to the request from the requester.

In addition, the Examiner appears to equate the ID and password assigned by the sponsor with form condition data. The present disclosure, for example, teaches that “a concept that includes form ID for *identifying a specific form uniquely and data for* 20 *identifying such a predetermined form group as a form class*, as well as *data for identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional expression* in which ‘XXX’ is set as the first three digits and a number of 22 or under is set in the lower two digits of the form ID.” (Page 4, last paragraph.) Broomhall, however, does not disclose or suggest *form condition data* as defined in the present invention. Neither Broomhall nor Paradox 25 disclose or suggest a concept that includes form ID for *identifying a specific form uniquely and data for identifying such a predetermined form group as a form class*, as well as *data for identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional expression*.

In the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner notes that the features upon which the Appellants rely (*identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional* 30 *expression* in which ‘XXX’ is set as the first three digits and a number of 22 or under is set in the lower two digits of the form ID) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Appellants note, however, that the feature relied upon, the form condition data, is recited in the rejected claims. Appellants' argument (above) which was cited by the Examiner was simply presented to explain the definition of "form condition data," as taught in the present specification.

5 Independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13 require registering or managing
form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated application* and proxy
applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said
delegated application respectively. Independent claims 3, 11 and 14 require registering
or managing delegation term condition data that identifies a term of requesting a
10 delegated application beforehand so as to be related to application requester specification
data that specifies an application requester and proxy applicant specification data that
specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said *delegated application*. Independent
claim 20 requires *form condition data* that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated
application*, and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is
15 requested for said *delegated application*.

Thus, Broomhall and Paradox, alone or in combination, do not disclose or
suggest registering or managing form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a
delegated application and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy
applicant who is requested for said delegated application respectively, as required by
20 independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, do not disclose or suggest registering or
managing delegation term condition data that identifies a term of requesting a delegated
application beforehand so as to be related to application requester specification data that
specifies an application requester and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a
proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by
25 independent claims 3, 11 and 14, and do not disclose or suggest form condition data that
identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, and proxy applicant specification
data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as
required by independent claim 20.

Claims 6, 17 and 23

30 Claims 6, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view Paradox. In the Examiner's

Answer, the Examiner acknowledges that Broomhall fails to explicitly teach that the forms are displayed according to the organization that the sponsor belongs to, but asserts that it would have been obvious to display those forms of the company the sponsor works for.

5 Claims 6, 17, and 23 require wherein said list of available electronic forms is decided according to an organization to which said application requester belongs. First, Appellants note that the cited claims are not directed to *displaying forms according to the organization that the sponsor belongs to*. Second, Appellants maintain that deciding the listing of available electronic forms according to an organization to which
10 said application requester belongs is not obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art and that the prior art actually teaches away from the present invention by teaching to list forms according to other characteristics, e.g. by type of form, as is well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

 Thus, Broomhall et al. and Paradox, alone or in combination, do not
15 disclose or suggest wherein said list of available electronic forms is decided according to an organization to which said application requester belongs, as required by claims 6, 17, and 23.

Claims 7, 18 and 24

 Claims 7, 18, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
20 unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of Paradox. Regarding claim 7, the Examiner asserts that a password indicates that the user system access is enabled to the external user as delegated by the sponsor, and that the user would be informed by the system whether the attempts to access the application have been enabled or succeeded.

 Claims 7, 18, and 24 require wherein each of said electronic forms
25 managed by said electronic form system is related to a delegated application flag indicating whether or not said delegated application is enabled; and said electronic form is available when said delegated application flag indicates "enable." As would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art, a password is not equivalent to a flag, and a password does not indicate that the user system access is enabled to the external user.
30 Appellants note that a "flag" is defined as a "variable that is set to a prescribed state, often 'true' or 'false,' based on the results of a process or the occurrence of a specified

condition.” (See, The IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms.) Thus, even a successful attempt to access the application utilizing a password cannot be considered a “flag,” as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Thus, Broomhall et al. and Paradox, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest wherein each of said electronic forms managed by said electronic form system is related to a delegated application flag indicating whether or not said delegated application is enabled; and said electronic form is available when said delegated application flag indicates “enable,” as required by claims 7, 18, and 24.

Additional Cited References

The Examiner also notes that the 35 USC statute does not require that every applied reference teach all the limitations. Appellants note that the arguments presented in the Additional Cited References section of the Appeal Brief were presented to note that *none of the cited references* disclosed or suggested certain limitations recited in the claims.

Conclusion

The rejections of the cited claims under sections 102 and 103 in view of Broomhall et al., Paradox, and Atlas et al., alone or in any combination, are therefore believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. The remaining rejected dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with respect to the independent claims.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,



Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: January 13, 2006

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.